REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This reply is responsive to an Office Action dated February 24, 2004.

Claims 1-12 have been cancelled without prejudice. New claims 13 through 17 have been added.

The new claims were added to emphasize the patentable novelty thereof. There is no intent to surrender equivalence.

Claim Objections

Claim 7 has been objected to because of the alleged informality. Claim 7 has been cancelled without prejudice.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. Section 112

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention, in that claim 7 does not provide sufficient antecedent basis for the term "the base." Claim 7 has been cancelled without prejudice.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. Section 103

Claims 3, 6, 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,228,796 to Kao in view of DE Publ. No. 195 47 964 A1 to Fitz.

Claims 3, 6, 11 and 12 have been cancelled without prejudice, and new claims 13-17 have been added.

Applicants' mounting arrangement is adapted to be used on stationary bicycles such as those used in gymnasiums or exercise clubs. The purpose of the device is to enable seats to be quickly and easily replaced on the exercise bicycle. In this manner,

the user can bring his or her own conventional bicycle seat and attach it to the stationary bicycle used at the facility.

Applicants' mounting arrangement is a sturdy, self-contained unit which can be quickly and easily mounted to a stationary bicycle, since applicants' mounting arrangement is adapted to be secured in place on the stationary bicycle in the same manner as a conventional bicycle seat. Once in place, the mounting arrangement enables one seat to be replaced with another seat in a quick and easy manner.

The Kao patent discloses a bicycle saddle tightening device having a clamping mechanism for securing a seat to a conventional bicycle. The Kao device is not intended to be used on a stationary bicycle for swapping bicycle seats. Instead, the light-weight Kao device is used for securely tightening a bicycle seat onto a bicycle. It is not intended to be used repeatedly as in the case of a gymnasium or sport club where Applicants' mounting arrangement can be used to swap seats many times during a single day.

The Kao device merely discloses a pair of clamps which serve as a tightening device for securing the bicycle seat to a conventional bicycle (not a stationary bicycle).

Therefore, Kao does not disclose, nor suggest, "a base member having a pair of parallel rods fixed to its underside for clamping to the stationary bicycle chassis." Instead, the Kao tightening device is mounted on a seat pillar 5 which is received in a bicycle seat tube 8.

The Kao patent furthermore does not disclose, nor suggest, "a horizontal disposed seat receiving platform supported on the base member." Kao does not have a "platform". Also, Kao does not have "a pair of front and a pair of rear crenellation-like upstanding projection members for receiving the pair of parallel frame members." Additionally, Kao does not teach "at least two of the projection members including

detents." Also, there is no suggestion of "a pair of parallel channels formed on the upper surface thereof and extending between the front and rear projection members."

The Kao patent furthermore does not suggest "an elongated lock block having a pair of latching curved recesses at the opposite ends thereof rotatably mounted on the platform." Instead, Kao merely discloses a pair of clamping devices. Applicants' compact mounting arrangement includes "the elongated lock block having a length less than the distance between the front and rear projecting members." Kao does not employ a "locking block."

The applicants' mounting arrangement enables the user to quickly swap bicycle seats since the bicycle seat can quickly and easily be attached to the mounting arrangement by first slipping the seat members into the four crenellation-like upstanding projection members "to properly align and secure the seat members on the platform." Once properly aligned on the platform, the seat can be locked in place by utilizing "a rotatably mounted lock lever for enabling the lock block to be rotated" so that "wherein the latching curved recesses secure upper intermediate portions of elongate seat frame members at an intermediate platform region so that the seat is thereby immovably locked onto the platform." Thus, applicants' mounting arrangement provides for the stable and secure alignment of the seat in the unlocked position of the mounting arrangement by the utilization of the crenellation-like upstanding projection members which include "detents for retaining releasably the seat frame members within the projection members." The "lock bar" is then used to provide a stable and secure latching of the seat to the stationary bicycle.

Kao also does not suggest, nor teach, "a pair of front and rear post members." Also, Kao does not teach "a pair of compression springs flanking the rear one of the post members to biased resiliently the platform into a generally parallel disposition relative to the base member." Also, there is no suggestion of "the front post member

having a threaded portion; and a tilt adjustment knob . . . to cause the platform to be moved to an adjusted front to rear tilted position."

The Fitz publication fails to disclose, nor suggest, a device used for facilitating the swapping of bicycle seats used on a stationary bicycle. Instead, the Fitz publication merely discloses a spring bias arrangement for automobile seats or chairs. There is no suggestion, nor teaching, of using the spring bias arrangement for a stationary bicycle. Also, the Fitz spring bias arrangement does not disclose, nor suggest, "a pair of compression springs flanking the rear one of the post members." Fitz does not disclose, nor suggest, "post members."

Neither Kao or Fitz teach nor suggest the applicant's amended claimed approach. Moreover, neither suggest nor provide any motivation to combine the cited elements to create the claimed mounting arrangement as claimed by the applicants.

As such, new claims 13-17 patentably distinguish over Kao in view of Fitz's German, disclosure either taken alone or in combination with other cited prior art.

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over KAO in view of FITZ as applied to claims 6, 11 and 12, and further in view of Szymski.

The Szymski patent discloses a bicycle seat which includes a base welded to a bicycle post to enable the height of the seat to be adjusted. It does not disclose, nor suggest "a base member having a pair of parallel rods fixed to its underside for clamping to the stationary bicycle chassis; a horizontally disposed seat receiving platform supported on the base number." In short, it is not disclosed, nor suggested by Szymski to have a device which can be secured to a stationary bicycle chassis in a manner of how a conventional seat is attached to the chassis. Also, the Szymski patent does not suggest all the other features specified in new claim 13.

Thus, new claims 13-17 patentably distinguish over the Szymski patent, either taken alone or in combination with Kao, Fitz or the other cited art.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over KAO in view of Fitz and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,383,706 to Chen.

Claims 7 and 8 have been cancelled without prejudice, and new claims 13-17 have been added.

The Chin patent discloses a bicycle seat adjusting assembly where the arrangement has a pair of vertically disposed rods interconnecting the base member and the chassis.

The Chin patent merely discloses a clamp for attaching a seat directly to a post for a bicycle. Such a device would not be suitable for quickly and easily swapping bicycle seats on a stationary bicycle. Also, it does not teach, nor suggest, the various elements as claimed by Applicants. For example, the Chin patent does not disclose, nor suggest, "a base member having a pair of parallel rods fixed to its underside for clamping to the stationary bicycle chassis; a horizontally disposed seat receiving platform supported on the base number."

In summary, none of the references cited in the Office Action disclose, nor suggest, a device which can be mounted to a stationary bicycle in a similar manner as a conventional bicycle seat. Also, none of the cited references disclose the other novel features, and structure as claimed by Applicants. Applicants' mounting arrangement not only mounts to a conventional stationary bicycle in a manner similar to a bicycle seat, but also Applicants' mounting arrangement provides for easy alignment and locking the seat in place using crenellation-like members, and a lock block for securely locking the seat in place after it is properly aligned. Moreover, Applicants' arrangement provides compression springs and the pivotally mounting of the platform on the base member to permit the base member and thus, the seat "to tilt laterally from side to side when the seat is being used." Also, the same mounting arrangement also employs a convenient tilt adjustment. In short, none of the devices disclosed in the prior art are

adapted to mount to a conventional stationary bicycle in a manner similar to a bicycle seat and possess all of the features claimed by Applicants. Also, as mentioned in Claims 14-17, there is no disclosure of "a cam arrangement," a platform "narrowed front portion," "parallel elongated grooves," and "a compression spring for resiliently biasing the lock block against the seat members."

For the above reasons, new claims 13-17 patentably distinguish over Kao, Fitz, Szymski and Chin, either taken alone or in combination with one another.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if such communication would expedite the prosecution of the application.

Please direct all correspondence to the undersigned attorney or agent at the address indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 23, 2004

By _____

Bernard L. Kleinke
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 22,123

DUCKOR SPRADLING & METZGER
A Law Corporation
401 West A Street, Suite 2400
San Diego, California 92101-7915

Telephone No.: 619.231.3666
Facsimile No.: 619.231.6629
Email Address: kleinke@dsm-law.com